

AZALEA ROSEA LOISELEUR IS A SUPERFLUOUS NAME

KATHLEEN A. KRON

*Department of Biology, University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599 – 3280, U.S.A.*

ABSTRACT

The case for lectotypification of *Azalea rosea* Loiseleur fails on two major points. Primarily, because the only type included in Loiseleur's description of *Azalea rosea* is that of *Azalea canescens* Michaux (a previously validly published name) and secondly because the lectotype recently designated is in conflict with the protologue and the intent of the original author.

INTRODUCTION

Shinners (1962) was indeed correct in his determination that *Rhododendron roseum* (Loiseleur) Rehder is an illegitimate name since it was based upon *Azalea rosea* Lois., which was superfluous when published.

Uttal (1988) has disagreed and has lectotypified *A. rosea*, by designating plate #64 in Duhamel (1812) as the type.

DISCUSSION

Since Loiseleur cited *Azalea canescens* Michaux as a synonym of *A. rosea* he thus included the type of a previously validly published name (*A. canescens* Michaux), making *Azalea rosea* Lois. superfluous (Art. 63.2, ICBN; see also Shinners 1962; Wilbur 1976) Furthermore, Loiseleur neither implicitly nor explicitly excluded the type of *A. canescens* Michaux, since nowhere else in the Duhamel publication did he discuss or describe *A. canescens* as a distinct species from *A. rosea*; he did not make any such distinction within the protologue of *A. rosea*. The fact that a plate accompanied the description is no special indication that Loiseleur was describing a new species, since he also included a plate with the description of *A. pontica* (#63) in the same publication. No special reference to plate #64 is indicated, so only one type was cited.

The protologue includes a description of the native habitat of *A. rosea* Lois. as "au bord des ruisseaux dans la Caroline"¹. While this is within the range and habitat of *R. canescens*, it is not within the distribution of *R. prinophyllum* (Small) Millais which is found north and west of the southern Blue Ridge mountains and has only been collected in two counties in ex-

¹ "along the borders of streams in Carolina"

treme western North Carolina during this century (see Kron 1987). Thus the protologue is in conflict with the lectotype designated by Uttal (1988; see Guide to determination of types, T.4.d., ICBN). If the plant which Loiseleur discussed had come from the mountainous regions of North Carolina, he most certainly would have indicated it, as he had done in preceeding descriptions of azaleas within the Duhamel text. No special significance can definitely be placed on the use of the word "rose" in the protologue, as the same word is used in the description of *A. periclymenoides* on the previous page.

Therefore, Loiseleur undoubtedly considered *Azalea canescens* Michaux and the plant he was illustrating to be conspecific (see also Rehder 1921). As such, he could not drop a previously validly published name and substitute a new one (see Wilbur 1976).

Lectotypification is only to be used when a type has not been cited. Loiseleur did include a type in his description: that of *A. canescens* Michaux by citing it as a synonym (Art. 63.2, ICBN) and therefore *A. rosea* is a superfluous name. In addition, the protologue does not contain any heterogeneous elements, only the plate appears to be what we now consider as distinct from *R. canescens*.

Since Loiseleur considered *Azalea rosea* as conspecific with *Azalea canescens* Michaux, his later name is superfluous, regardless of subsequent taxonomic decisions regarding species limitations. Therefore, the correct name for the roseshell azalea is *Rhododendron prinophyllum* (Small) Millais.

Rehder's (1921) publication of *R. roseum* (Lois.) Rehder as a new combination is invalid because a new combination cannot be based on a superfluous or invalid basionym (see Art. 45.1, ICBN). Therefore lectotypification of *Azalea rosea* Lois. is effectively the publication of a new species, which dates from 1988 (Uttal), or 1921, if Rehder's publication is accepted (see Art. 45.3, ICBN). Thus *Rhododendron prinophyllum* (Small) Millais is still the correct name for the roseshell azalea, since it is based on an earlier legitimate name (*Azalea prinophylla* Small, 1914. N. Amer. Fl. p. 42).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank Dr. Walter S. Judd and Dr. David F. Chamberlain for their helpful comments and suggestions on this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- KRON, K. A. 1987. A taxonomic revision of *Rhododendron* L. section *Pentanthra* G. Don. University of Florida. Ph.D. dissertation.
 LOISELEUR-DESLONGCHAMPS. 1812. In: Duhamel du Monceau, H. L. Traite Arb. Arbust. ed. 2. 5:221–227, t. 63 and 64.

- REHDER, A. 1921. The azaleas of North America. In: Wilson E. H. and A. Rehder. A monograph of Azaleas. Publ. Arnold Arbor. 9:109 – 219.
- SHINNERS, L. H. 1962. *Rhododendron nudiflorum* and *R. roseum* (Ericaceae): Illegitimate names. Castanea 27:94 – 95.
- UTTAL, L. 1988. Lectotypification of *Azalea rosea* Loiseleur (Ericaceae), and a recombination in *Rhododendron periclymenoides* (Michaux) Shinnars. Sida 13(2):167 – 169.
- VOSS, E. G. (Chairman) 1983. International code of botanical nomenclature. Utrecht, Netherlands.
- WILBUR, R. L. 1976. Illegitimate names: *Rhododendron nudiflorum* (L.) Torr. and *R. roseum* (Loisel.) Rehder. Taxon 25:178 – 179.